

Appl. No. 10/655,258

Amendment dated September 2, 2005

Response to Office Action of May 2, 2005 and Advisory Action of August 12, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings:

None.

Appl. No. 10/655,258

Amendment dated September 2, 2005

Response to Office Action of May 2, 2005 and Advisory Action of August 12, 2005

Remarks

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action of May 2, 2005, and the subsequent Advisory Action of August 12, 2005. The proposed amendments filed August 2, 2005 were not entered. By way of this amendment, claims 2-4 have been canceled, and claims 1, 5, 6, and 11 have been amended. Claims 1-22 are currently pending. Claims 8-10 and 12-22 stand withdrawn. The proposed Amendment After Final is believed to place the application in condition for allowance or at least in better form for appeal without presenting new issues requiring substantial further consideration. Applicant requests further review and reconsideration in light of the following remarks.

Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 4, 5, and 7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response to this indication, claim 1 has been rewritten to include all of the features of claims 2, 3, and 4. It is noted that claim 4 originally recited that "said control valve and said shaft" cooperatively define means for retaining the control valve in a selected flow position. This minor error has been corrected and this claim limitation, as incorporated into claim 1, now recites that the housing and the shaft cooperatively define means for retaining the control valve in a selected flow position. This is consistent with the description of the retention means in the specification and the remainder of the claims. Amended claim 1 is therefore believed to be allowable over the cited prior art.

Minor amendments have been made to claims 5 and 6 to make them consistent with amended claim 1.

Applicant has rewritten claim 11 to recite that the overpressure plug is adapted to be forced out of the relief vent when the pressure of said fluid within the housing exceeds a predetermined level.

The term "adapted to be" has been added to make it clear that the ejection of the plug at a certain pressure is not merely a desired result. Rather, the structural

Appl. No. 10/655,258

Amendment dated September 2, 2005

Response to Office Action of May 2, 2005 and Advisory Action of August 12, 2005


characteristics of the overpressure plug (e.g. its shape and dimensions) are chosen such that it will "pop out" of the housing above the selected pressure, as explained in paragraph [0042] of the specification.

Claims 5-7 and 11 depend from claim 1 and are thus believed to be allowable as well.

Previously non-elected and withdrawn claims 8, 9, and 10, and pending claim 11 recite different species of an over-pressure relief mechanism. Specifically, claim 8 relates to the selective fitting of upper and lower control valve seals, claim 9 relates to a generic pressure relief means, claim 10 relates to a relief valve, and claim 11 recites an overpressure plug, as noted above. All of these claims depend from and further limit claim 1. In light of the above arguments that claim 1 is allowable, it is respectfully requested that claims 8-10 should be considered along with claims 1-7 and 11, and that they are allowable without requiring substantial further consideration.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the objections and rejections is requested. Allowance of claims 1 and 5-11 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


Jonathan M. Hines
Registration No. 44,764

Jonathan M. Hines
ADAMS EVANS P.A.
2180 Two Wachovia Center
Charlotte, North Carolina 28282
Tel. 704-375-9249
Fax: 704-375-0729
e-mail: jmh@adamspat.com
File: 3108/2